



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,652	03/07/2006	Jorge Diniz Queiroga Loureiro	41952/314792	1516
23370	7590	07/17/2008	EXAMINER	
JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ			HOANG, SON T	
KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1100 PEACHTREE STREET			2165	
ATLANTA, GA 30309				
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		07/17/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/531,652	LOUREIRO, JORGE DINIZ QUEIROGA	
Examiner		Art Unit	
SON T. HOANG		2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3-16 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 3-16 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 April 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2.) Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3.) Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on March 12, 2008. Applicant's submission has been entered.

Title, abstract and specification of the disclosure have been amended.

Claims 1-2 have been canceled.

Claims 3, and **15** have been amended.

Claims 3-16, and **18-20** are pending in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments to the claims have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues towards independent **claims 3, 15, and 18**, regarding the fact that Anthony does not teach or suggest linking the sub-portions of each portion of the database to one another in a predetermined sequential arrangement.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's remark. Accordingly, Anthony discloses prior to displaying the first page of a topic, the comparison with the topic names is conducted for that page. The comparison for subsequent pages of that topic is also undertaken, preemptively while the first page of text is displayed, until the entire text for that topic has been compared, or the user has moved to a new topic 500. Text is thus linked a page at a time for the topic the viewing user has requested. The invention thus assumes that the user is likely to display the next page of the topic and so preemptively links the next pages while the user is reading the first page. The

sequence is then repeated for the newly displayed topic as shown by steps 100 and 500 in Figure 4 ([Column 5, Lines 19-31]). This citation clearly anticipates the argued limitation.

In view of the above, the Examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this instant Office action. Hence, Applicant's arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior arts of record.

For the above reasons, the Examiner believes that rejection of this instant Office action is proper.

Priority

3. Applicant's withdrawn priority of South African Application No. 2001/8533 filed on October 17, 2001 is confirmed. The priority date of this instant application is October 17, 2002 (claims benefit of PCT/IB2002/004273).

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o).

The specification fails to provide a definition and/or limitation(s) for the “computer-readable medium” cited in **claims 3, and 15**, thus insufficiently supports the claimed ‘computer-readable medium’. Applicant is suggested to change from “computer-readable medium” to “computer-storage medium”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate Paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this Section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 3, 15-16, 18,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Anthony (*Pat. No. US 5,815,830, published on September 29, 1998*).

Regarding **claim 3**, Anthony clearly shows and discloses a computer program product stored on a computer-readable medium and executable by a processor, the computer program product comprising:

program instructions for managing content of a database of information relating to a particular topic ([Column 3, Lines 40-42]), wherein the database includes a number of portions which each contain information on a particular aspect of the topic is stored and which are each sub-divided into a number of sub-portions (*The database contains the following text and picture portions: Earth, Jupiter, Mercury, Our moon, Pluto etc. and their corresponding text description sub-portions, [Column 5, Line 65 → Column 6, Line 10]; and*)

program instructions for linking the sub-portions of each portion of the database, to one another in a predetermined sequential arrangement wherein each subsequent sub-portion in the sequential arrangement contains further information on the topic (*When a user selects the portion “planet” of “planets of our solar system” topic, the sub-*

portion text of “planet” is shown and contains the text description for portion “planet”. This text description sub-portion of “planet” contains hyperlinks to “Jupiter”, “Satellites of Jupiter”, “Io” and “Rings of Saturn” as shown in [Column 6, Line 40 – Column 7, Line 13]. If the user clicks the mouse on any of the hyperlinked words which refer to any of text / picture portions in [Column 6, Lines 1-10], they would automatically be taken to that portion and its associated sub-portion text would be displayed with again any hyperlinks automatically found and highlighted, [Column 6, Line 1 → Column 7, Line 13]. See further [Column 5, Lines 19-31] for linking to subsequent topics).

Regarding **claim 15**, Anthony clearly shows and discloses an information management product ([Column 3, Lines 40-42]), which comprises:

a database component containing information relating to a particular topic (*A database has been created to cover the topic: planets of our solar system, [Column 5 Lines 65-67]*), the database component being stored on a computer-readable medium and including a number of portions in which information on a particular aspect of the topic can be stored, each portion being sub-divided into a number of sub-portions (*The database contains the following text and picture portions: Earth, Jupiter, Mercury, Our moon, Pluto etc. and their corresponding text description sub-portions, [Column 5, Line 65 → Column 6, Line 10]*); and

a computer program component for managing the content of the database ([Column 3, Lines 40-42]), the computer program component being stored on the computer-readable medium and executable by a processor including program

instructions for linking the sub-portions of each portion of the database to one another in a predetermined sequential arrangement wherein each subsequent sub-portion in the sequential arrangement contains further information on the topic (*When a user selects the portion “planet” of “planets of our solar system” topic, the sub-portion text of “planet” is shown and contains the text description for portion “planet”. This text description sub-portion of “planet” contains hyperlinks to “Jupiter”, “Satellites of Jupiter”, “Io” and “Rings of Saturn” as shown in [Column 6, Line 40 – Column 7, Line 13]. If the user clicks the mouse on any of the hyperlinked words which refer to any of text / picture portions in [Column 6, Lines 1-10], they would automatically be taken to that portion and its associated sub-portion text would be displayed with again any hyperlinks automatically found and highlighted, [Column 6, Line 1 → Column 7, Line 13]. See further [Column 5, Lines 19-31] for linking to subsequent topics.*)

Regarding **claim 16**, Anthony further discloses an information management product, wherein the sub-portions are linked to one another in a predetermined sequential arrangement wherein each subsequent sub-portion in the sequential arrangement can contain further information on the topic (*When a user selects the portion “planet” of “planets of our solar system” topic, the sub-portion text of “planet” is shown and contains the text description for portion “planet”. This text description sub-portion of “planet” contains hyperlinks to “Jupiter”, “Satellites of Jupiter”, “Io” and “Rings of Saturn” as shown in [Column 6, Line 40 – Column 7, Line 13]. If the user clicks the mouse on any of the hyperlinked words which refer to any of text / picture portions in [Column 6, Lines 1-10], they would automatically be taken to that portion and its*

associated sub-portion text would be displayed with again any hyperlinks automatically found and highlighted, [Column 6, Line 1 → Column 7, Line 13]).*

Regarding **claim 18**, Anthony clearly shows and discloses a method of compiling a database of information relating to a particular topic ([Column 5, Line 65 → Column 7, Line 13]), which includes the steps of:

compiling a number of portions of the database, wherein each portion contains information on a particular aspect of the topic and wherein each portion is sub-divided into a number of sub-portions (*The database contains the following text and picture portions: Earth, Jupiter, Mercury, Our moon, Pluto etc. and their corresponding text description sub-portions, [Column 5, Line 65 → Column 6, Line 10]*); and

linking each of the sub-portions of each portion of the database to one another in a predetermined sequential arrangement wherein each subsequent sub-portion in the sequential arrangement contains further information on the topic (*When a user selects the portion “planet” of “planets of our solar system” topic, the sub-portion text of “planet” is shown and contains the text description for portion “planet”. This text description sub-portion of “planet” contains hyperlinks to “Jupiter”, “Satellites of Jupiter”, “Io” and “Rings of Saturn” as shown in [Column 6, Line 40 – Column 7, Line 13]. If the user clicks the mouse on any of the hyperlinked words which refer to any of text / picture portions in [Column 6, Lines 1-10], they would automatically be taken to that portion and its associated sub-portion text would be displayed with again any hyperlinks automatically*

found and highlighted, [Column 6, Line 1 → Column 7, Line 13]. See further [Column 5, Lines 19-31] for linking to subsequent topics).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 4-7, 14, and 19-20,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony (*Pat. No. US 5,815,830, published on September 29, 1998*) in view of Flinn et al. (*Pub. No. US 2001/0047358, filed on March 13, 2001; hereinafter Flinn*).

Regarding **claims 4, and 19**, Anthony discloses establishing a user-executable navigation link from at least one sub-portion of the database to another sub-portion of the database, thereby permitting a user to navigate from said one portion to said other sub-portion, and returning a user to the sub-portion from which the navigation link is made, in use ([Column 6, Line 1 → Column 7, Line 13]). However, Anthony does not explicitly disclose recording the address in the database of each sub-portion from which a navigation link is made.

Flinn discloses the referenced information may include files, text, documents, articles, images, audio, video, multi-media, software applications and electronic or magnetic media or signals. Where the content object supplies a pointer to information,

the pointer may be a memory address. Where the content network encapsulates information on the Internet, the pointer may be a Uniform Resource Locator (URL), [0044])

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Flinn with the teachings of Anthony for the purpose of managing information encapsulates the information as objects by facilitating the relationship between the objects ([Abstract] of Flinn).

Regarding **claims 5, and 20**, Anthony further discloses displaying a view of the sub-portion from which the navigation link is made, in the same format as it was displayed before the navigation link to another sub-portion was made (*If the user clicks the mouse on any of the hyperlinked words which refer to any of text / picture portions in [Column 6, Lines 1-10], they would automatically be taken to that portion and its associated sub-portion text would be displayed with again any hyperlinks automatically found and highlighted, [Column 6, Line 1 → Column 7, Line 13]*)

Regarding **claims 6, and 14**, Flinn further discloses recording and displaying title information representing each sub-portion from which the navigation link is made (*meta-information include a title, a sub-title, one or more descriptions of the topic provided at different levels of detail, the publisher of the topic meta-information, the date the topic object was created. Meta-information may also include a pointer such as uniform resource locator (URL), [0045] - also see [0111] for displaying the metadata*)

Regarding **claim 7**, Anthony further discloses defining primary key expressions in information that is stored, in use, by a compiler in selected sub-portions of the database

and for establishing said navigation link to said other sub-portion of the database by a user selecting said primary key expression (*When a user selects the portion “planet” of “planets of our solar system” topic, the sub-portion text of “planet” is shown and contains the text description for portion “planet”. This text description sub-portion of “planet” contains hyperlinks to “Jupiter”, “Satellites of Jupiter”, “Io” and “Rings of Saturn” as shown in [Column 6, Line 40 – Column 7, Line 13]. If the user clicks the mouse on any of the hyperlinked words which refer to any of text / picture portions in [Column 6, Lines 1-10], they would automatically be taken to that portion and its associated sub-portion text would be displayed with again any hyperlinks automatically found and highlighted, [Column 6, Line 1 → Column 7, Line 13]).*

9. **Claims 8-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony (*Pat. No. US 5,815,830, published on September 29, 1998*) in view of Flinn et al. (*Pub. No. US 2001/0047358, filed on March 13, 2001; hereinafter Flinn*) and further in view of Flora et al. (*Pat. No. US 6,714,215, filed on May 19, 2000; hereinafter Flora*).

Regarding **claim 8**, Anthony, as modified by Flinn, does not explicitly disclose establishing explanatory notes in which information can be entered by a compiler and for defining secondary key expressions in information that is stored, in use, by a compiler in selected sub-portions of the database and for linking each secondary key expression to a particular associated explanatory note in an arrangement wherein the selection of a primary key expression by a user will cause the associated explanatory note to be displayed.

Flora discloses the user is able to execute a hyperlink and display an expanded version of the visual media item. The user can jump to an expanded version of a visual media item that could include such things as explanatory text, related text articles or further hyperlinks to related information ([Column 7, Lines 39-52]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Flora with the teachings of Anthony, as modified by Flinn, for the purpose of allowing a user to directly access items of visual and/or audio media by passing a cursor over points on an electronic map ([Abstract] of Flora).

Regarding **claim 9**, Flora further discloses defining primary key expressions in said explanatory notes and for establishing said navigation link from primary key expressions in said explanatory notes, to pre-determined sub-portions of the database (*a user is able to execute a hyperlink and display an expanded version of the visual media item. This expanded version could include further hyperlinks to related information or related text articles, ([Column 7, Lines 39-52]). It is obvious that these further hyperlinks could be primary expressions which link to another portion of the database*).

Regarding **claim 10**, Flora further discloses defining secondary key expressions in selected explanatory notes and for linking each secondary key expression to another explanatory note (*a user is able to execute a hyperlink and display an expanded version of the visual media item. This expanded version could include further hyperlinks to related information or related text articles, ([Column 7, Lines 39-52]). It is obvious that*

(these further hyperlinks could be secondary expressions which link to another portion of the database).

Regarding **claim 11**, Flinn further discloses establishing default explanatory notes in which information can be entered by a compiler, the program instructions being operable to display the default explanatory note simultaneously with the information in a particular sub-portion of the database (*The topic-based navigation mode enables users to view and select topic objects in the content network. When a topic object is selected, the display interface is reorganized to allow the direct viewing of the meta-information associated with the topic object as well as related topic objects. Further, during the topic-based navigation mode, the display interface includes a related content window, which presents a summary of content objects that are pertinent to the selected topic. Accordingly, meta-information for the related content object is displayed, as well as related objects, [0110]-[0111]).*

10. **Claims 12-13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anthony (*Pat. No. US 5,815,830, published on September 29, 1998*) in view of Flinn et al. (*Pub. No. US 2001/0047358, filed on March 13, 2001; hereinafter Flinn*) and further in view of Flora et al. (*Pat. No. US 6,714,215, filed on May 19, 2000; hereinafter Flora*) and further in view of Nielsen (*Pat. No. US 5,761,436, published on June 2, 1998*).

Regarding **claim 12**, Anthony, as modified by Flinn and Flora, does not teach a feedback component including program instructions permitting any part of the information contained in a sub-portion or explanatory note of the database, to be selected by a user, and for the user's selection to be recorded.

Nielson discloses a user interface that allows a user to interact with a computer display by pointing at selectable control areas on the display and activating a command or computer operation associated with the selectable control area ([Column 4, Lines 11-15]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Nielson with the teachings of Anthony, as modified by Flora and Flinn, for the purpose of allowing the user to more quickly find and reference previously viewed hypernode by providing a hypertext user with a history facility for displaying accessed hypernodes ([Abstract] of Nielsen).

Regarding **claim 13**, Nielson further discloses recording users' selections of primary and secondary key expressions (*A user interface that allows a user to interact with a computer display by pointing at selectable control areas on the display and activating a command or computer operation associated with the selectable control area, [Column 4, Lines 11-15]*). *It's obvious that the primary and secondary key expressions are recorded since their accessed records are used to make up the history list for displaying accessed hypernodes.*

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Son T. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1752. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (7:30 AM – 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on (571) 272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Son T Hoang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2165
July 08, 2008

/S. P./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2164

/Christian P. Chace/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2165